

## **REMARKS**

In the Official Action mailed on **12 August 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-24. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because it is not tangibly embodied. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because it is not tangibly embodied. Claims 11-16 and 19-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 due to their dependency on claims 9 and 17 respectively. Claims 1 and 3-8 were allowable.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claims 9 and 11-16 were rejected as not being tangibly embodied.

Applicant has amended paragraph [0020] of the specification to remove the intangible embodiments of the storage medium.

Claims 17 and 19-24 were rejected as not being tangibly embodied.

Applicant has canceled claims 17 and 19-24 without prejudice.


Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 9 to reduce prolixity.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 9 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-8, which depend upon claim 1, and claims 11-16, which depend upon claim 9, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 16 September 2005

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95616-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
FAX: (530) 759-1665